

**From:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Sent:** 27 February 2007 12:31  
**To:** 'John Donovan'  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Donovan,

In your email to me of 20th February, 2007, you stated, inter alia, that:

**"Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded.** It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade."

In response I can confirm that there was no letter or other communication from Mr van der Veer concluding or indicating that Mr Brinded had been wrong to dismiss Mr Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Equally, when Mr Brinded spoke to the Shell members of the PSMR team at the end of last year, he did so entirely of his own volition. No one had instructed him to do so. The proposed statement to EP staff was being prepared by Shell in joint consultation with Mr Campbell, as an attempt to find a mutually acceptable way forward with him - at the same time taking this as another opportunity to re-stress critical safety messages internally, and associating Mr Campbell with them positively. The contents of that proposed statement were discussed at some length with Mr Campbell, and the more familiar use of "Bill" was intended to make the tone more engaging for staff - especially as this was how Mr Campbell was known by former colleagues, including by Mr Brinded - and not to imply that Mr Campbell had been in direct contact with Mr Brinded in recent years.

Accordingly, I do not believe that there is any basis for you including reference to any such purported communication in your article.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
 General Counsel Exploration and Production  
 Shell International B.V.  
 The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27155369  
 Address: c/o Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands  
 Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
 Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]  
**Sent:** 27 February 2007 09:45  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Ruddock

We note the usual blanket denial.

26/03/2007

51

We are however publishing an article today which includes reference to a Letter of Censure involving Mr Jeroen van der Veer and Mr Malcolm Brinded. This is obviously an important matter in its own right.

If you are able to categorically state that there is no substance whatsoever to any such letter or communication, then we will remove all reference to it.

The article will be published this afternoon.

Regards  
John Donovan

---

**From:** keith.ruddock@shell.com [mailto:keith.ruddock@shell.com]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 13:31  
**To:** john@shellnews.net  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Donovan

We disagree fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of the material you have produced but believe that no useful purpose would be achieved by engaging in a detailed rebuttal. We continue to expressly reserve our position in respect of these matters.

Regards

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
General Counsel Exploration and Production  
Shell International Exploration and Production B.V.  
The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27002688  
Address: Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands  
Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

- Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be *"false and misleading"*.
  - Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.
  - In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.
  - Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PSMR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admittances were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.
  - That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.
  - **Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded.** It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.
  - Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was **"thoroughly ashamed"**.
  - **Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."***
- Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

Since we have not even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement, it seems reasonable to conclude that Shell is not interested in the offer. Consequently, unless we hear from you by 2pm UK time today we will assume that Shell does not wish to take up the offer and will not bother Shell further on the matter.

While writing, I would also like to draw your attention to the following article.

ShellNews.net: Update on lawsuits against Royal Dutch Shell

No doubt Shell will let us know if it disputes what we say in this article.

Regards  
John Donovan

26/03/2007

53

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 16:21  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

I acknowledge receipt of your email. As it happens, publication is no longer imminent. A UK national newspaper has expressed an interest in the story. We have already supplied them with the draft article and will forward on the documents received from our source. There will likely be a brief respite while the newspaper in question speaks to our sources and also tries to make contact with Mr Campbell to verify facts. No doubt they will also get into contact with Shell if a story is to be published this weekend. Otherwise we will publish.

Note that you took no issue with the statement about Shell's acknowledgement of our freedom to publish candid views about Shell on the Internet.

Coincidentally we have also been in correspondence with a well known Russian newspaper who approached us today about the prospect of publishing an article about our involvement in the Sakhalin-2 debacle.

We manage to keep busy.

Regards  
John Donovan

---

**From:** keith.ruddock@shell.com [mailto:keith.ruddock@shell.com]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 13:31  
**To:** john@shellnews.net  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Donovan

I disagree fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of the material you have produced but believe that no useful purpose would be achieved by engaging in a detailed rebuttal. We continue to expressly reserve our position in respect of these matters.

Regards

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
General Counsel Exploration and Production  
Shell International Exploration and Production B.V.  
The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27002688  
Address: Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands  
Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

26/03/2007

54

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]

**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17

**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

- Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be *"false and misleading"*.
- Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.
- In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.
- Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PSMR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admittances were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.
- That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.
- **Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded.** It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.
- Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was *"thoroughly ashamed"*.
- Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."*

Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

## Shell Brent Scandal: Leaked Feb 2006 Inspection Report containing damning photographic evidence

By John Donovan

We have been supplied with a copy of a leaked M B Close Visual Inspection Report dated 24 February 2006 carried out for Shell on the Brent Bravo platform. M B Inspection is a major provider of Integrity Engineering, Inspection and other specialist services to the Oil & Gas and Petrochemical Industries.

The M B inspection was performed early in February 2006 on the stairwell of the Brent Bravo platform utility leg where two men, Keith Moncrieff and Sean McCue, were killed in September 2003. The recent related Fatal Accident Inquiry concluded that their deaths were preventable.

At the time of the M B Inspection, Shell was (and apparently still is), very keen to replace much of the pipe-work in the utility leg. Things like the "oil run down lines" taking produced oil to the storage cells in the bottom of the leg had to be replaced because of 'wall thinning'. It has been a commercial priority to get this work done in order to get back to full production ASAP.

The work is also part of Shell's improvement commitments to the UK's Health & Safety Executive after the deaths, which resulted in the record breaking fine of £900,000 (\$1.6 million approx) imposed on Shell, which has admitted responsibility for the HSE offences. The problem Shell faced in February was whether to delay the work on the pipelines to carry out the essential repair work clearly required on the stairwell.

This may not have been such an issue had the elevator in the utility leg been working, but it was inoperative and required/requires major work to bring it back into service.

Shell claims that "safety is our priority". In fact, the word "safety" was used no less than 18 times in an email dated 17 July 2006 sent by Shell CEO Jeroen van der Veer, "to all Shell employees" to signify the great importance he supposedly attaches to safety issues.

### Leaked Jeroen van der Veer email

Bearing these claims in mind and the tragic history of Brent Bravo in particular, you might reasonably expect that safety considerations would indeed be paramount. Apparently not so!

Despite the damning findings of the M D Inspection Report, nothing was done. Shell has continued to put men up and down the stairway round the clock in order to push the pipeline work on. This went on until mid-July (about four weeks ago) with the workforce completely ignorant of the dangers they faced as the inspection report had been 'buried'. Then, after workers noticed movement on the stairs as they climbed out one day, Shell management was forced to act.

This development, coupled with the leaking of the M D Inspection Report, with its truly horrifying photographic evidence, finally forced their hand. The Health & Safety Executive have apparently issued an Improvement Notice on Shell forcing Shell to carry out extensive repairs on the stairwell.

Shell senior managers claim they were in the dark about the M D Inspection Report and have apparently initiated an internal investigation to determine why it was not acted on at the time.

56

Nothing surprising there: a further helping of the "blind eye culture" culture of Shell management.

This is another manifestation of the deeply ingrained corporate culture of spin, cover-up and deceit which resulted in the reserves fraud which destroyed the reputation of Shell and brought about the unification into Royal Dutch Shell Plc. The only problem is that some of the same discredited incompetent executive directors tainted by past scandals remain at the helm of Shell.

Whilst discussing fraud and scandal, it is worth recalling that according to the former Shell International Group Auditor, Mr Bill Campbell, his official investigation in 1999 discovered that ESDV leak-off tests were purposely falsified, not once, but many times. He has also alleged that the inaction of members of Shell management, including the Managing Director of Shell Expro in 1999, Malcolm Brinded, contributed to the unlawful killings.

The "blind eye culture" by Shell senior management mentioned above, has been described by Bill Campbell as "a hostile environment of extreme denial". These shocking events provide concrete proof of the extent to which Royal Dutch Shell management will go to maximise profits while ignoring the risks for the workers at the coal face tasked with the work to achieve Shell's goals.

That immoral policy cannot be allowed to continue.

The disgraced "Sir" Philip Watts, the crook at the helm of Shell until March 2004, still ended up with a severance package worth \$18.5 million and indemnification against any legal claims arising from his misdeeds at Shell.

Workers lives must be put before the greed and ambition of Shell senior managers intent on acquiring untold riches and a knighthood provided they display sufficient ruthlessness.

Leaked MB Brent Bravo Inspection Document

**From:** John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 27 February 2007 15:05  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Ruddock

I am grateful for your response. We will not publish this story until we have considered your response carefully and we will certainly take into account the information you have kindly provided. We may seek further clarification from you on the same issue after checking with our sources and information already in our possession.

In this connection, it might be helpful for you to see one of the three documents recently supplied to us by a source (not Bill Campbell). The Making of Amends document (printed below) is the main reference source for our draft article. I may be able to let you have sight of the other documents which run to over a hundred pages if you would like to see them prior to publication (we will be publishing all three documents).

We would ideally like Shell to have a proper opportunity to clarify, rebut, or correct any such information, particularly if you are able to do so on a categorical basis. We are prepared to delay publication to this end.

An indication of the importance of this matter can be gauged from the fact that you have now included Michiel Brandjes in the correspondence. We realised the significance of the story immediately we received the documents and want to deal it on a responsible basis. Hence our approach to Shell in the first place.

Regards  
 John Donovan

DOCUMENT STARTS...

Proposed Defamation Proceedings

### **The Making of Amends**

Reaction to general press releases issued by Shell and to the internal communications to EP staff in June 2006 notified Jeroen van der Veer, the CEO of Shell that it was my intention of taking Shell to Court for defamation of character

#### **Why did you do this?**

The EP Crisis team issued the following communiqué in June 2006 to the worldwide EP population. The communiqué is false and misleading to the point of being deceitful, with statements considered by me to be defamatory. In addition newspapers were given disclaimers known to me to be also false and misleading, some examples

My claim that Brent Bravo in 1999, and a significant number of other North Sea offshore installations were operating in 2003 at that time with high risk levels was met with robust rebuttal from Shell quote the allegations regarding operating with high risk levels is untrue, and we absolutely refute this unquote

The CEO issued statements internally and carried up by the press that in 1999 there was no verified evidence of falsification of maintenance records

26/03/2007

58

In response to questions from media sources \* that in 1999 senior managers allowed a goal widening approach to extend Safety Critical Equipment performance criteria for ESD valves and deluge systems with no prior approval or assessment of risk Shell state quote That this is simply not true unquote

\* Rebuttal from Stuart Bruseeth, Head of Global Media Relations – Shell International to journalists

### **Why do you think these press statements are defamatory?**

Shell Legal Counsel as part of the mediation process which I cover below state that it was never the intention of Shell to defame my character, and lack of intention is a defense against defamation in Law. It will be up to a judge and jury to determine this, but in simple terms if you accuse someone of not telling the truth then you are effectively calling them a liar. Anyway, in the electronic attached document 'Progress with Safety' I cover these examples in detail.

### **Why do you think the EP Communiqué is defamatory?**

Because of some of its content, quote you may be aware that the Upstream magazine published an article making a number of very serious allegations against Shell in its operation of the Brent field and, very personal, and completely unjustified, attacks on current and former members of Shell's staff and management. Shell strongly refutes these allegations. Safety is Shell's foremost priority at all times and we absolutely reject any suggestion that we would compromise safety offshore.

In 1999, Shell initiated the Platform Safety Management Review, in which Campbell was asked to participate, and responded vigorously to its findings.

A follow up implementation audit conducted at the end of 2000 confirmed significant progress had been made on both asset integrity and management systems.

This contributed to the continuous improvement in Shell's safety performance that has been achieved since 1999 in the North Sea.

In late 2004, Mr. Campbell made allegations to Shell about his perception of a lack of follow-up to the PSMR. Shell took his claims very seriously and a thorough investigation concluded

his perception was not supported by the evidence, and

neither was the serious allegations concerning individuals

We are currently reviewing our legal position and reserve all our rights in respect of resorting to legal action to protect our reputation and that of our current and former staff. Safety is, and will remain our first priority at all times unquote

### **What action did you take in response to the EP and press releases?**

On the 23rd September I wrote to the CEO and copied to Greg Hill who is understood to have been the leader of the EP Crisis team directly responsible for the transmission of communiqué.

See below extract of letter to Jeroen van der Veer

informed Jakob Stausholm that his unexpected call to me, at the time of the newspaper articles being released in June, **had been accidentally recorded.**

-In this conversation, where he repeatedly asks what can be done to bring an end to these matters etc I reiterate to him the true account of his investigation findings.

He does not on the taped conversation refute any of this and quickly disassociates himself from the EP crisis team media releases and internal memos to staff. He says 'it was done without his input', he 'was not involved', thus excusing himself and Richard Sykes from the formation of the wording of the releases. It appears they were simply told to sit on the sidelines and not get involved.

All this is very damaging since here we have your Chief Internal Auditor, and leader of the internal investigation, essentially agreeing that the releases are known by him to be false and misleading, I offered to send him the tape recording, but to date that offer has been declined. You now are personally involved since your reply to me on the maintenance records falsification issue\* is post the notification and warning to Stausholm not to perjure himself because this tape existed.

There are two roads ahead, either

you, and others will be required to give testimony before a Judge and Jury at Edinburgh Court of Sessions in a defamation hearing where this recorded evidence and some 154 pages of copied data, internal memos and reports will be presented to support my case, or you

compromise by discussing another way ahead.

I have no stomach for putting good people like Merry, Madden, Mutimer and many others into court to testify (as they surely will) against their employer.

In a later telephone conversation with Keith Mutimer, who had been asked to contact me by Greg Hill, Mutimer requested if I would sit down with Hill to bring an end to all this.

Keith Mutimer informed me that he together with Madden and Merry had discussed the press releases with Hill. They had indicated clearly (as they did I understand in 2005 when interviewed by Stausholm & Sykes), that they supported my claims, including that maintenance records etc were falsified etc, (because it was essentially their audit findings also). They pointed out to Hill that the EP press and internal releases brought their character into question also.

I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career.

When challenged by me in a note directed to him that indeed maintenance records had been falsified the CEO personally involved by replying that there was no verified evidence of this. Thus you have the CEO, perched at the pinnacle of the organization, with oversight over the Company, the Rule Maker if you like, in denial of an audit report produced as part of his own Company business controls framework. That is what the 1999 PSMA audit findings stated, that is what also is stated in the briefing note from the Shell Expro Internal Audit Manager to the Oil and Gas Director on 20th and 22nd October 1999.

Is the CEO really saying that his loyal and dedicated current employees Hoskins, Mutimer, Merry and Madden, and his retired Audit Manager Gerbrand Moeyes are lying. Is that what he is saying?

We don't live under the third Reich or in some totalitarian banana republic where history can be airbrushed out of existence, so although the truth may be unpalatable to the CEO, and his Executive Director it will not go away. His actions are reminiscent of the Phil and Walter affair, where the latter wanted an internal report buried out of sight, because it was dynamite, nothing seems to have changed at the top, where non-compliance rules ok.

26/03/2007

60

**What was the reaction of the CEO?**

He instructed his legal counsel to commence an arbitration or mediation process with me to reach a compromise without me reverting to legal action, what the legal people call 'making amends' to reach a situation acceptable to both parties. This mediation process commenced in September/November last year and the EP Legal Counsel Keith Ruddock contacted me. We have met twice near my home.

**What can be reasonably inferred by this decision by the CEO?**

That there was a case to answer and it was in his interest, and Shell's interest to reach a compromise rather than going to law. I think the readers can agree you do not enter into a mediation process voluntarily to make amends to a person claiming defamation if you are innocent of that defamation, after all I am supposed to have made unjustified attacks on employees past and present. Would you deal with someone who did that?

**What were the implications of your conversation with Stausholm?**

Jakob, in the post oil reserves debacle era had a key role as EP Chief Internal Auditor in a Company which was said by him, and supported by public statements, to have strengthened its business controls framework significantly.

He had a role in the new governance and controls regime to investigate any claims of impropriety against Shell executives. Thus he, assisted for a time by Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, carried out an investigation into the followed up from the 1999 PS MR audit.

What Jakob clearly and unambiguously states in the recorded conversation is that the EP communiqué did not take into account the factual evidence from his investigation report. His report was ostensibly ignored. This he implied was a conscious decision to give strong rebuttal to the Upstream magazine outpourings but as a consequence he accepted this had the secondary effect as a punishment against me.

**Why would the CEO and the Executive Director subvert their own internal investigation?**

I think in the outpourings from Upstream magazine they were taken by surprise and the press releases were not in extremis to counteract this, a sort of knee jerk reaction. They could not achieve the level of denial necessary if they took the investigation findings into account, so they ignored it because the truth was very inconvenient.

**Who was responsible for this?**

Well the immediate responsibility was the EP Crisis team. However Greg Hill, who is generally well regarded, had in the interview with BBC Scotland agreed that the PS MR follow-up was handled badly and that individuals had falsified maintenance records. So he must have known his press releases were false and misleading but I can only assume, like Stausholm & Sykes, he was instructed to toe the line in the common good.

The coercion to do this must lie with the Executive Director and/or the CEO or both, these officials having oversight over the process. I am in no doubt that Hill, Stausholm and Sykes were complicit in this cover-up but I bear them no malice, as obedient officers, I assume they were responding to the commands of their generals.

**What does this mean with reference to enhanced business controls framework post the oil reserves debacle?**

24 months or less after the oil reserves debacle, we are again witnessing the purposeful act of Shell deceiving their employees, stakeholders and Society as a whole. As in 2004, when the truth is inconvenient to your chief executives, they simply corrupt their own oversight processes by subversion of their own internal investigation

report.

The published improvements in the business controls framework, the increased involvement of the non-executives, the role of the Chief Internal Auditor, the golden rules, the modification of the SGBP to include a clause on compliance have all been demonstrated to have been a waste of time and effort.

The only difference between the reserves debacle, and the Brent Bravo scandal, is the latter is not about commercial ethics, it's about the unlawful killing of two young men, and hiding from public scrutiny, the culpability of the then Shell Expro Directors in those deaths.

### **What then was the true account of the Stausholm/Sykes investigation?**

The investigation found no evidence that the short term measures in 1999 recommended to immediately reduce risk on Brent Bravo were ever carried out - The investigation found that the long term actions to reverse the negative safety culture were truncated when only 20% complete

The investigation reported that in general the members of the PSMR team interviewed were supportive of me and corroborated in great measure what I alleged, and, like me had this abiding sense of failure, abject failure, that our attempt in 1999 to get Directors of Shell to accept the validity of their own internal audit findings was unsuccessful

That the Oil Director Chris Finlayson has never answered the charge of why he did not revoke his misleading remarks to media, workforce and HSE re the Touch Fuck All instruction and it appears he only reluctantly accepted the findings in 1999 'to prevent a bun fight between Auditors and the Brent team'

That the decision of Malcolm Brinded to keep the Brent Asset Manager in position because he was concerned about his mental wellbeing was described by Richard Sykes as 'astonishing' and 'inexplicable', no explanation was given why he did not consider the position of the General Manager, and Deputy Asset Manager

That Peter Wyatt, in 1999 the HSE Manager in Shell Expro could not remember in 2005 the contents and discussion of a prolonged meeting at which he arbitrated between the audit team and the Brent General Manager. At that meeting the Deputy Asset Manager admitted, amongst many other things, that ESDV leak-off tests had been purposely falsified. Richard Sykes stated he was 'disappointed' by Peter Wyatt during his interview with him. My assumption was that he considered Peter was being economic with the truth rather than suffering from amnesia.

That Malcolm Brinded's decision to dismiss the SIEP Lead Auditor was because the Brent Management team would not be perceptive to his continued involvement in the audit follow-up and remedial action planning - but that this decision had never been communicated to the Lead Auditor at the time, or since

That the General Manager of Brent refused to attend the 22nd October meeting although he knew most of the serious findings were coming his way. Despite my plea to the Oil Director to postpone the meeting, in line with Shell Group audit principles (that is not to discuss the findings of an audit without the principal auditee being present), the meeting went ahead

That almost no files were now available in UEFA (Internal Audit) department in Aberdeen related to PSMR, they had gone unexplainably missing

That the PSMR files held by EPS-HE library in the Hague had to be replaced in 2003 by me as they had also gone missing

That contrary to recent Shell press statements, no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000, but on Brent Charlie. Richard Sykes discussed his disappointment in that fact as the Brent Charlie audit did not throw much light on whether, or whether not, improvements had been made post the PSMR findings

26/03/2007

## Was the CEO fully aware of these findings?

At the meeting on 25th July, 2005 with the CEO and the senior EP legal counsel all the above was discussed. Legal counsel had not prepared a summary of the investigation and would not discuss the findings with me, or say what impact these findings may have. He indicated when he had completed a summary that this would be presented to the CEO. Some months later Stausholm informed me that the CEO had written to Malcolm Brinded (I understood this to be a letter of censure) covering at least two points, namely That

1. Shell Expro should have completed the immediate actions to reduce risks on Brent Bravo as recommended to management on 22nd October 1999, and
2. That Malcolm Brinded should not have dismissed the SIEP Lead Auditor. If he had concerns with the PSMR findings, or the role of the Lead Auditor, or the singular recommendation by the Lead Auditor to suspend from duty the Brent Management team, he should have discussed these with him as a minimum explaining the rational behind his decision

## In the mediation with Shell what terms of settlement did you indicate would be satisfactory to stop defamation proceedings?

My terms for settlement put to Shell EP legal Counsel was in four parts – not particularly onerous and not putting Shell at unacceptable risk

Shell EP would issue a statement to the same audience as the EP communiqué. This statement would demonstrate in some part atonement and apology – this is the draft Note from Malcolm Brinded in the Appendix

As a condition of settlement Malcolm Brinded was to apologize personally to the PSMR team members Liz Hoskins, John Madden, Ken Merry (the Deputy Lead Auditor) and Keith Mutimer

Shell were to apologize to the enforcing authority (the HSE) for the failure in 1999 of the Oil Director Chris Finlayson to retract the statement given to the HSE on 9th September 1999 with reference to the so called, touch fuck all instruction

Shell was to make reparations with their workforce for their failure to notify the workforce on Brent Bravo in 1999 of the unacceptable risks on that platform at that time. This failure to notify the workforce was repeated in 2003 when chronic weaknesses were highlighted by the post fatality Technical Integrity Review team on 14 other offshore installations and reparations were requested here also

## What progress has been made to date?

With reference to part (1)

The process with the Malcolm Brinded statement (see Appendix) was going reasonably well, although it was 'soft' and to a great degree let Shell 'off the Hook' I was prepared to accept this as the only realistic outcome. I did not expect Shell to prejudice themselves by making a stronger statement, for example that there were 'significant shortcomings'. This would have been my preferred wording.

Unfortunately to date, the mediators in the process, Kieron McFadyen and the Shell EP legal counsel Keith Ruddock, have been unable to get Shell to agree on the final wording of the statement. The process has been dragging on and I indicated to Shell that if we could not get agreement by 26th January I would withdraw from the settlement process. The stumbling block is based on one word (shortcomings). It would appear that Malcolm Brinded could not stomach this mild rebuke.

I got an update from Keith Ruddock on 26th January where Shell want to replace the sentence containing shortcomings with the following quote I also recognize that though follow up to the 1999 PS MR was vigorously pursued at the time, I am sure there are areas where, with the benefit of hindsight, we could have done better unquote.

### **What was your reaction to this Proposed change?**

I am afraid I cannot accept this. It appears to me evidence of continuing denial. The reality is that the PS MR was not vigorously pursued. What vigor was expended was wasted energy, as it was ineffective.

In the electronic attachment in the form of PowerPoint I tell something of the story questioning whether there was Progress with Safety, or whether this progress was illusionary, a fable worthy of Hans Christian Andersen at his best.

It's up to others to judge, just look at the facts

### **Have Shell explained why they want to remove 'shortcomings'?**

To soften the message, a form of wordsmithing, a skill in which Shell are world class. Legal counsel has explained why Malcolm Brinded wants to drop the word shortcomings quote on the follow up to the PS MR, I think that the reference to "shortcomings" may cause concerns as it is not clear whether these were major failings or small sights but as it concerns safety it is nonetheless a statement which will raise questions and would be picked up by the press and could re-open the whole debate unquote

Now I think any reasonable interpretation of this reply from Legal Counsel is that he is not disputing that there were shortcomings, but that if they use this word (i.e. get truthful for once in line with our stated business principles) then this will over excite our employees and the press who inevitably will get there hands on the statement.

With reference to Part (2) - Apologizing to the 1999 PS MR team members

I have been advised that Malcolm Brinded has spoken to the PS MR team members Hoskins, Madden, Merry and Mutimer and this is covered already in the Shell statement (see Appendix)

With reference to Part (3) - Apologizing to the enforcing authority, the HSE

Kieron has met with the new Head of the Offshore Safety Division (the HSE) in Aberdeen.

Later, along with the Shell UK Country Chairman James Smith, met with the CEO of the HSE. Kieron advised me at our last meeting that these were bridge building meetings where Shell did indicate atonement for past dealings and wished to lay the foundation for better and more open communications in the future.

With reference to Part (4) - Talking to the workforce about past failures in communication

I did not get in the discussions any information on any action re reparation to workforce on failure by Shell to make them aware of risks on their respective offshore installations and any action to reduce risks both in 1999 and 2003.

On a positive Note however the OILC (workforce representative's organisation) has, at Kieron's initiative, been involved more openly with Shell to establish better relationships and understanding and this is to be welcomed.

When you read the Note from Malcolm you get the feeling of intimacy between us, as if we discussed these issue together over a beer. I have not seen Malcolm since I think early 1996 and my only communication with him was a personal letter sent by me in December 2004. Its just another example of what we call in modern parlance spin however I have no objections to it being written in this manner, but just so as you are aware.

26/03/2007

64

You will see from the letter that I was employed by SIEP (on a part-time basis) as a consultant from 2003 till May 2006 leading or being involved in six major HSE -MS audits.

You might find it surprising therefore that in June 2006, a Company that had employed me, and commended me for my work, considered suddenly that I had made some very personal, and completely unjustified attacks on current and past Shell employees.

Would you employ a Consultant who had done that for over two years after he had made these allegations? These allegations were put to Malcolm in the letter of December 2004, he was asked if he had any objections to them being made public, either in a paper, or book, he raised no objections then, or since.

Whilst on the point, some folks who knew me in Aberdeen were critical as to why I did not raise these concerns when I worked with Shell. Well at the time when I was dismissed as Lead Auditor of the PSMR, on return to The Hague the issue was taken up with the HSE Manager, who discussed with Phil Watts and through my line to the Regional Director for Europe, Bob Sprague. I was never informed what actions, if any, they took.

I also was confident that the HSE, investigating the workforce concerns re Touch Fuck All, and all this getting onto BBC TV news and headlines in P&J and The Scotsman, would quickly get to the bottom of all this stuff and come across the PSMR findings. They did not, and why they did not is another story, for another day.

But more importantly, the two men were killed in September 2003, over a year after I had left full employment with SIEP on early retirement on the first of September 2002.

Bill Campbell

#### **APPENDIX – EXTRACT FROM WORKING DOCUMENT**

The following is an extract from the agreed working discussion draft of the 29th November 2006. This Draft was prepared to reflect discussion between David Richmond, acting as a witness to events and myself. Representing Shell was Kieron McFadyen who most people are aware is the new EP corporate HSE Manager and a Shell EP legal counsel Keith Ruddock.

The Note was to be issued from the Executive Director Malcolm Brinded to specific EP staff i.e. EPLT, EPLF and Europe staff together with all HSE safety professionals, senior maintenance community staff – JG3+ - and all audit professionals. The title of the Note was Safety Takes Priority

Working Draft -- Colleagues

Outcome of Learning Review

Further to the previous communications sent to you regarding UK North Sea safety, I wanted to provide you with an update on where we are and to share some personal reflections. As you know, earlier in the summer there was considerable publicity regarding the 1999 UK Platform Safety Management Review (PSMR) and its follow-up. We have recently carried out a learning review of how we responded to the publicity and debate that surrounded the comments made by Mr. Bill Campbell in relation to the PSMR which were widely reported in the media. Our review process also included two meetings with Bill Campbell. The aim was to fully understand his remaining concerns while at the same time soliciting his feedback on how he viewed our handling of the matter.

Throughout our statements on this issue, we have always tried to make it clear that, we recognise and respect Bill Campbell's professional and technical skills. Indeed, he was engaged by Shell as a HSE audit consultant as recently as this year. We recognise too that his motivation in raising these issues was a desire to improve safety and in particular was prompted by his frustration at not having had his evidence heard at the Brent Bravo Fatal Accident Inquiry. He now accepts that the decision not to call him as a witness at the FAI had nothing to do with

26/03/2007

6

Shell. Whilst we do not agree with all that he said, there are many areas on which we are aligned, and in particular we recognise the way in which the PSMR was followed up that there were shortcomings at the time and it could have been handled better. Again in the spirit of openness I wanted to share with you the outcome of our engagements with him. [REDACTED] and Shell clearly share the same overriding aim of seeking continuous improvement in Shell's operational and HSE performance across our business.

Seven years on, it is clear that the PSMR in 1999 was a pivotal event in Shell's ongoing safety journey in the North Sea. I want to be clear that the contributions made by each of the members of the PSMR team, including [REDACTED] were important in providing the basis for much of what has followed in safety improvements.

I have also now engaged with each of the Shell PSMR team members and relayed this message to them in person. In my view, the PSMR spurred on our focus on asset integrity and was a key stimulus for our efforts to address the "hearts and minds" aspects of safety, which have become such a major part of our EP global safety agenda. It was also a key step on our safety journey which has led, amongst other things, to the establishment of the Golden Rules, the inclusion of compliance as a separate principle in the SGBP and has influenced the way in which we look at Technical Integrity, of which more below.

I also want personally to say that I recognise that we could have handled aspects of the PSMR report-out in 1999 a better way. The key learning being that, whatever differences of view exist, individuals who raise safety concerns should feel that their messages are being well understood and responded to. The experience also underlines the critical importance of Internal Audit in ensuring that such messages are identified, elevated and heard. Both [REDACTED] and I also believe that, although we need to absorb the learning from past experiences, it is time now to move forward. What is clearly important within EP is that we reinforce our focus on safety - and ensure that we deliver, as we should on our stated vision of making safety our number one priority in all that we do.

Many thanks [REDACTED]

---

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]

**Sent:** 27 February 2007 09:45

**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Ruddock

We note the usual blanket denial.

We are however publishing an article today which includes reference to a Letter of Censure involving Mr Jeroen van der Veer and Mr Malcolm Brinded. This is obviously an important matter in its own right.

If you are able to categorically state that there is no substance whatsoever to any such letter or communication, then we will remove all reference to it.

The article will be published this afternoon.

Regards  
John Donovan

---

**From:** keith.ruddock@shell.com [mailto:keith.ruddock@shell.com]

**Sent:** 20 February 2007 13:31

**To:** john@shellnews.net

**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Donovan

We disagree fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of the material you have produced but believe that no useful purpose would be achieved by engaging in a detailed rebuttal. We continue to expressly reserve our position in respect of these matters.

Regards

Keith Ruddock

67

**From:** John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 27 February 2007 19:35  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Ruddock

This is my detailed response.

It is probably wrong of me to be suspicious of lawyers, but I note that you chose to respond to my email of 20<sup>th</sup> February 2007, rather than answer directly the question I asked today about what you describe as a "purported communication". It would be very easy for you to clear up this point by simply answering on an unambiguous basis the question I put to you today. You now also have the precise formulation used by Mr Campbell to describe the Letter of Censure. An unambiguous categorical denial would also deal with what he has stated on that aspect. Otherwise the door is left open that such a communication was contemplated or issued, even if the content was different to that stated in our draft or by Mr Campbell.

I note the confirmation that Mr Brinded did speak to Shell members of the PSMR team at the end of last year on this subject. Perhaps you will find Mr Campbell's account in "The Making of Amends" document to be more accurate than our interpretation.

If you want to deal with "The Making of Amends" on a detailed basis (which we would welcome) then for the sake of clarity and the understanding of our readers, it would be appreciated if you would use plain unambiguous language so that there is no room left for doubt or misinterpretation. You could insert your comments in red text in the appropriate places throughout the document. It would be published on unedited basis. We are always willing to publish on that basis any response which Shell wishes to make to any article published on our websites. That is a standing invitation. I do not believe that we could be fairer.

Regards  
 John Donovan  
 Royaldutchshellplc.com

---

**From:** keith.ruddock@shell.com [mailto:keith.ruddock@shell.com]  
**Sent:** 27 February 2007 12:31  
**To:** john@shellnews.net  
**Cc:** jeroen.vanderveer@shell.com; Malcolm.Brinded@shell.com; Jorma.Ollila@shell.com; richard.wiseman@shell.com; michiel.brandjes@shell.com  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Donovan,

In your email to me of 20th February, 2007, you stated, inter alia, that:

"Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded. It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade."

26/03/2007

13

In response I can confirm that there was no letter or other communication from Mr van der Veer concluding or indicating that Mr Brinded had been wrong to dismiss Mr Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Equally, when Mr Brinded spoke to the Shell members of the PSMR team at the end of last year, he did so entirely of his own volition. No one had instructed him to do so. The proposed statement to EP staff was being prepared by Shell in joint consultation with Mr Campbell, as an attempt to find a mutually acceptable way forward with him - at the same time taking this as another opportunity to re-stress critical safety messages internally, and associating Mr Campbell with them positively. The contents of that proposed statement were discussed at some length with Mr Campbell, and the more familiar use of "Bill" was intended to make the tone more engaging for staff - especially as this was how Mr Campbell was known by former colleagues, including by Mr Brinded - and not to imply that Mr Campbell had been in direct contact with Mr Brinded in recent years.

Accordingly, I do not believe that there is any basis for you including reference to any such purported communication in your article.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock

General Counsel Exploration and Production

Shell International B.V.

The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27155369

Address: c/o Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)

Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]

**Sent:** 27 February 2007 09:45

**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo and Mr Bill Campbell

Dear Mr Ruddock

We note the usual blanket denial.

We are however publishing an article today which includes reference to a Letter of Censure involving Mr Jeroen van der Veer and Mr Malcolm Brinded. This is obviously an important matter in its own right.

If you are able to categorically state that there is no substance whatsoever to any such letter or communication, then we will remove all reference to it.

The article will be published this afternoon.

Regards

John Donovan

**From:** keith.ruddock@shell.com [mailto:[keith.ruddock@shell.com](mailto:keith.ruddock@shell.com)]

**Sent:** 20 February 2007 13:31

**To:** john@shellnews.net

**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Donovan

We disagree fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of the material you have produced but believe that no useful purpose would be achieved by engaging in a detailed rebuttal. We continue to expressly reserve our position in respect of these matters.

Regards

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
General Counsel Exploration and Production  
Shell International Exploration and Production B.V.  
The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27002688  
Address: Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands  
Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]

**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17

**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

- Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be *"false and misleading"*.
- Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.
- In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.
- Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PS MR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admissions were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.

26/03/2007

10

- That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.
- Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded. It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.
- Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was "thoroughly ashamed".
- Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."*

Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

Since we have not even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement, it seems reasonable to conclude that Shell is not interested in the offer. Consequently, unless we hear from you by 2pm UK time today we will assume that Shell does not wish to take up the offer and will not bother Shell further on the matter.

While writing, I would also like to draw your attention to the following article.

[ShellNews.net: Update on lawsuits against Royal Dutch Shell](#)

No doubt Shell will let us know if it disputes what we say in this article.

Regards  
John Donovan

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 28 February 2007 09:35  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** Letter of Censure sent to Mr Malcolm Brinded

Dear Mr Ruddock

It is only fair to advise you of further information regarding the above subject.

I have previously mentioned taped conversations. We have overnight reviewed a relevant tape which records a discussion between Mr Campbell and someone very senior at Shell. During the conversation, the letter to Mr Brinded is specifically described as a Letter of Censure. The content is also discussed.

The content of the taped discussion is at variance with what you have stated. Please bear this in mind when giving any further response, particularly any unambiguous categorical denial. You already have Mr Campbell's account of the information in the relevant letter which tallies with the content of the taped discussion.

I believe all we know what letter we are talking about even if Shell now chooses to take the view that it was not a Letter of Censure, despite evidence to the contrary.

Regards

John Donovan

23/03/2007

72

## ShellNews.net: Shell CEO Letter of Censure to Malcolm Brinded, Executive Director of Shell EP

Jeroen van der Veer drawn into Brent Bravo unlawful deaths scandal

By John Donovan

In August 2006, I wrote a tongue-in-cheek "Open Letter" to Shell CEO, Jeroen van der Veer about the Brent Bravo scandal asking...

### ShellNews.net: When is Shell going to sue former Shell International Group Auditor Bill Campbell for defamation?

It appears that I should have addressed the question to Bill Campbell asking when HE would be issuing defamation proceedings against Shell. He is currently preparing to issue a libel action against Shell following the breakdown of a mediation process which has been secretly going on behind the scenes for some time.

While it seemed to the outside world that the repercussions of the Brent Bravo scandal had subsided, with media focus switched to BP's troubles, Shell has in fact been trying to keep a lid on sensitive information emerging relating to the untimely deaths of innocent Brent Bravo workers. Sensitive because the machinations personally involve Shell CEO Jeroen van der Veer and Malcolm Brinded, the Executive Director of Shell EP. As will become clear, Brinded had a vested interest in trying to cover-up past events.

Campbell decided to make a principled stand against unprincipled Shell executives who failed to deal competently and ethically with corrupted safety procedures exposed in a safety audit of the Brent Bravo North Sea oil platform led by Campbell. Shell typically reacted with threats and a campaign to discredit him followed by an attempt to pacify Campbell when their reprehensible tactics were exposed. Apparently Shell forgot that Campbell retains the support of many Shell insiders.

From reading the Campbell documents (links below) supplied to us by a source (not Bill Campbell), it is obvious that Campbell was shaken to his core by the way Shell management savagely turned on him after he acted in accordance with Shell's core business principles, which have been promoted over the years in global advertising campaigns. Campbell had been convinced that Shell management meant at it said about honesty, integrity and respect for Shell employees.

He was taken in, like others before him, by the high moral tone of Shell's propaganda - The Shell General Business Principles (the SGBP), directed at a gullible public. The point arrived when the penny finally dropped and Campbell realised that the great company he loves is now run by charlatans who, contrary to the PR hype and spin, put profits and personal gain before principles.

Campbell discovered the harsh reality: an astonishing true story of deceit, deception, coercion, malice, corruption, libel, treachery, cover-up (with vital documents, by coincidence or otherwise, conveniently disappearing like magic from more one location) and above all, breathtaking hypocrisy e.g. the unprincipled actions of Shell management, completely at odds with the pious pledges in the SGBP.

Relevant events also involve other Shell directors, senior managers and officials including Tom Botts, Jakob Stausholm, Richard Sykes, Chris Finlayson, Keith Ruddock, Peter Wyatt, Kieron McFadyen, Bob Sprague, James Smith, Greg Hill and David Bayliss.

Because of the importance of the matters covered in this article, we emailed extracts to Keith Ruddock, Shell International General Counsel for Exploration and Production with an offer to supply the complete draft article.

You will see from the email correspondence which was all between me (John Donovan) and Mr Ruddock, that both parties, Bill Campbell and Shell, entered into a "Making of Amends" process. This involved Shell making amends to Mr Campbell, not the other way round.

In this connection, the main focus of the discussion was on a "Letter of Censure" sent by Jeroen van der Veer to Malcolm Brinded. Mr Ruddock stated in one email: "I do not believe that there is any basis for you including reference to any such purported communication in your article." Unfortunately for Mr Ruddock there is irrefutable evidence of the letter and its content.

To read the full article including associated documents and email correspondence, go to...

<http://shellnews.net/2007/shell-ceo-letter-of-censure-1-march-2007.html>

**From:** John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 01 March 2007 12:37  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** RE: Mr Bill Campbell and Shell

Dear Mr Ruddock

With the greatest respect, instead of the bobbing and weaving you could have simply stated that in the context of the above subject there has been no letter that could be construed as a Letter of Censure.

The fact that you are unable to make an unambiguous denial along these lines speaks volumes.

The article will be published this afternoon along with the associated documents and email correspondence.

There is any further response, I will add it to the published correspondence.

Otherwise I will consider that the correspondence has ended.

Regards  
 John Donovan

**From:** keith.ruddock@shell.com [mailto:keith.ruddock@shell.com]  
**Sent:** 28 February 2007 17:50  
**To:** john@shellnews.net  
**Cc:** jeroen.vanderveer@shell.com; Malcolm.Brinded@shell.com; Jorma.Ollila@shell.com; richard.wiseman@shell.com  
**Subject:** Mr Bill Campbell and Shell

Dear Mr Donovan

I refer to your emails of 27th February and 28th February. I have attempted to answer your points in an open manner. It is clear that you are endeavouring to ascribe meanings to my comments which go beyond a natural interpretation. Given your responses, I do not believe that it is constructive to continue a dialogue on this topic with you. In any event, the matters described in "The Making of Amends" document relate to areas of disagreement between Shell and Mr Campbell. Mr Campbell has now retained a solicitor to advise him on these issues. We therefore believe that the appropriate avenue of communication on these matters going forward is properly between us and Mr Campbell and his legal advisers.

Please note, however, that the lack of a rebuttal from, or comment by, Shell does not in any way constitute an acceptance on Shell's part of any of the points made by you or Mr Campbell, whether now or in the future, and we continue to reserve our position in respect of those matters.

Yours sincerely

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
 General Counsel Exploration and Production  
 Shell International B.V.  
 The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27155369  
 Address: c/o Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands

23/03/2007

76

tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]

**Sent:** 28 February 2007 09:35

**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

**Subject:** Letter of Censure sent to Mr Malcolm Brinded

Dear Mr Ruddock

It is only fair to advise you of further information regarding the above subject.

I have previously mentioned taped conversations. We have overnight reviewed a relevant tape which records a discussion between Mr Campbell and someone very senior at Shell. During the conversation, the letter to Mr Brinded is specifically described as a Letter of Censure. The content is also discussed.

The content of the taped discussion is at variance with what you have stated. Please bear this in mind when making any further response, particularly any unambiguous categorical denial. You already have Mr Campbell's account of the information in the relevant letter which tallies with the content of the taped discussion.

I believe all we know what letter we are talking about even if Shell now chooses to take the view that it was not a Letter of Censure, despite evidence to the contrary.

Regards

John Donovan